term "non-Q infarction," so common in today's literature, represents sloppy thinking and sloppy science. Infarcts due to circumflex disease may be very large and occasionally fatal and almost never cause Q-waves. Significant anterior wall infarction often reduces R-wave amplitude without resulting in Q-waves. The statement that non–Q-wave infarcts are different from those with Q-waves is using terminology that misrepresents the pathology. The viewpoint article by Phibbs and colleagues (2), reviewing this issue in detail three years ago in *JACC*, should be required reading. The editorial staff can discourage the use of this term by insisting that researchers who are ignorant of the pathology of infarction read the article by Phibbs et al.

Myrvin H. Ellestad, MD
Long Beach Memorial Medical Center
Memorial Heart Institute
2801 Atlantic Avenue
Long Beach, California 90801-1428
E-mail: mellestad@memorialcare.org

PII S0735-1097(02)02615-3

REFERENCES

1. Kerensky RA, Wade M, Deedwania P, Boden WE, Pepine CJ. Revisiting the culprit lesion in non–Q-wave myocardial infarction: results from the VANQWISH trial angiographic core laboratory. J Am Coll Cardiol 2002;39:1456–63.
2. Phibbs B, Marcus F, Marriott HJC, Moss AJ. Q-wave versus non–Q-wave myocardial infarction: a meaningless distinction. J Am Coll Cardiol 1999;33:576–82.

REPLY

Dr. Ellestad assails our recent publication (1) on the angiographic findings that characterize the "culprit lesion" in patients with acute non–Q-wave myocardial infarction (MI) as representing "sloppy thinking and sloppy science." We presume this contentious allegation is directed toward our use of the term "non–Q-wave MI," which, along with the comparator term "Q-wave MI," is abhorred by Dr. Ellestad and others (2) who contend that this binary classification system "misrepresents the pathology" of MI and has been termed variably as "a halfway house of the intellect" (3), as having "no basis in scientific fact" (3), and as being "a meaningless distinction" (2). Such pemicious rhetoric serves only to discredit the stature and integrity of the physician assailants and to reinforce the belief that such strong contrarian views are discordant with mainstream cardiology opinion and practice.

At the time that the VANQWISH trial was conducted (1993 to 1996) and reported (1998) (4), the accepted terminology promulgated by both major national cardiology organizations (American College of Cardiology and American Heart Association) consistently endorsed the terms "Q-wave" and "non–Q-wave" MI in their Consensus Management Guidelines (5), suggesting that subject-matter experts and opinion leaders in cardiology did not consider such concepts and terms meaningless or irrelevant.

More recently, of course, the older nomenclature of "Q-wave" and "non–Q-wave" MI has been replaced by a new binary classification system ("ST-segment elevation" and "non–ST-segment elevation" MI), but because our current study was undertaken in an era when the former classification was both widely accepted and used, we decided for the sake of consistency to use the term "non–Q-wave" MI rather than "non–ST-segment elevation" MI in reference to our recent coronary angiographic substudy (1).

We lament Dr. Ellestad's uncritical assertion that both the *JACC* editorial staff and the VANQWISH investigators are "ignorant of the pathology of infarction." We are all well aware of the important distinction by which total or subtotal occlusion of the circumflex or obtuse marginal branch coronary circulation can "masquerade" as "non–Q-wave" MI; in fact, we were the first to document (in 1987) the early electrographic findings of true posterior MI (6), based on our careful and comprehensive assessment of serial electrocardiograms (ECGs) in the Diltiazem Reinfarction Trial (7). Moreover, we have contributed significantly to the cardiology literature regarding the important electrocardiographic features of non–Q-wave (non–ST-segment elevation) MI, (8–10) and obviously incorporated these same rigorous criteria for use in the VANQWISH study (4), which, we believe, permitted us to accurately and reliably exclude posterior MI from our study population.

Although our views are unlikely to dissuade Dr. Ellestad and the vocal minority of cardiologists who tenaciously adhere to the holistic notion that "an infarct is an infarct" electrocardiographically, pathogenetically, clinically, angiographically, and prognostically—a view, unfortunately, that ignores and disdains an abundance of scientific information that has been acquired and assimilated over more than 25 years of careful study—we hope that our recent report on the angiographic characteristics of "culprit lesions" will aid more cognitive cardiologists to focus on ways of optimizing the care and management of their patients with non–Q-wave/non–ST-segment elevation MI rather than getting "lost among the forest and trees" of a largely outmoded terminology battle that is of little relevance to contemporary clinical practice.

William E. Boden, MD, FACC
Program Director
Division of Cardiology
The Henry Low Heart Center at Hartford Hospital
80 Seymour Street, JB722
Hartford, Connecticut 06102

On behalf of the VANQWISH Trial
Core Angiographic Laboratory Investigators

PII S0735-1097(02)02614-1

REFERENCES

1. Kerensky RA, Wade M, Deedwania P, Boden WE, Pepine CJ. Revisiting the culprit lesion in non–Q-wave myocardial infarction: results from the VANQWISH trial angiographic core laboratory. J Am Coll Cardiol 2002;39:1456–63.
2. Phibbs B, Marcus F, Marriott HJC, Moss AJ. Q-wave versus non–Q-wave myocardial infarction: a meaningless distinction. J Am Coll Cardiol 1999;33:576–82.
3. Phibbs B. "Transmural" versus "subendocardial" myocardial infarction: an electrocardiographic myth. J Am Coll Cardiol 1983;1:561–4.
4. Boden WE, O'Rourke RA, Crawford MH, et al. Outcomes in patients with acute non–Q-wave myocardial infarction randomly assigned to an invasive as compared with a conservative management strategy. N Engl J Med 1998;338:1785–92.
5. Ryan TJ, Antman EM, Brooks NH, et al. 1999 update: ACC/AHA guidelines for the management of patients with acute myocardial infarction: executive summary and recommendations: a report of

JACC Vol. 40, No. 12, 2002
December 18, 2002:2204–6

the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Committee on Management of Acute Myocardial Infarction). J Am Coll Cardiol 1999;34:890–911.

6. Boden WE, Kleiger RE, Gibson RS, Schechtman KB, Capone RJ, Roberts R, for the Diltiazem Reinfarction Study Group, Brown University, Providence, RI. Electrocardiographic evolution of posterior myocardial infarction: importance of early precordial S-T-segment depression. Am J Cardiol 1987;59:782–7.
7. Gibson RS, Boden WE, Theroux P, et al., for the Diltiazem Reinfarction Study (DRS) Group. Diltiazem and reinfarction in patients with non–Q-wave myocardial infarction: results of a double-blind, randomized multicenter trial. N Engl J Med 1986; 315:423–9.
8. Boden WE, Kleiger RE, Gibson RS, et al., for the Diltiazem Reinfarction Study Group, Brown University, Providence, RI. Electrocardiographic and enzymatic findings in acute non–Q-wave myocardial infarction. Am J Noninvas Cardiol 1988;2:125–33.
9. Boden WE, Spodick DH. Diagnostic significance of precordial ST-segment depression. Am J Cardiol 1989;63:358–61.
10. Boden WE, Kleiger RE, Gibson RS, et al. Favorable long-term prognosis of acute non–Q-wave myocardial infarction associated with absent or nonspecific electrocardiographic changes. Br Heart J 1989; 61:396–402.